

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 13-15, cancels claims 9-12 and adds new claims 16-24. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 13-24.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to consider the Information Disclosure Statement filed on May 27, 2004. A copy of said May 27, 2004 Information Disclosure Statement is attached herewith. Also, submitted on even date herewith is an Information Disclosure Statement submitting a listing of references for consideration by the Examiner. An indication that each of the May 27, 2004 and August 6, 2004 Information Disclosure Statements have been considered is respectfully requested.

Claim 14 stands rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of prior patent No. 6,170,010 and claim 14 stands rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as the invention. With respect to each of these rejections, claim 14 as originally presented depended from claim 1. As noted by the Examiner claim 1 has been canceled. Amendments were made to claim 14 to place it in independent form including all the limitations of originally filed claim 9. Therefore, each of the above noted rejections should be reconsidered and withdrawn being that each were premised on claim 14 as originally presented being depended from claim 1.

The same also applies with respect to the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claim 14 as being anticipated by Mayo (U.S. Patent No. 5,751,965). As indicated above,

claim 14 was substantially amended particularly to recite the features recited in originally presented claim 9 and additional features not taught or suggested by the references of record. Thus, claim 14 has been amended to be substantially different from that examined by the Examiner with respect to the 35 USC §102(e) rejection. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claim 14 as being anticipated by Mayo is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-13 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kisor (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,091) in view of Chou (U.S. Patent No. 5,902,352); and claim 15 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kisor and Chou in view of Behm (U.S. Patent No. 5,414,845). As indicated above, claims 9-12 were canceled. Therefore, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 9-12 as being unpatentable over Kisor in view of Chou is rendered moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The above noted rejections with respect to the remaining claims 13 and 15 are traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 13 and 15 are not taught or suggested by Kisor, Chou or Behm whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

Amendments were made to each of claims 13-15 so as to more clearly recite that the present invention is directed to a computer operation management system which includes a managing computer and a plurality of computers to be managed. According to the present invention, each computer to be managed includes a unit

which receives operation defining information from the managing computer, a unit which causes execution of an operation processing including at least one job execution control, power supply control and printing execution control in accordance with the operation defining information from the receiving unit, a unit which transmits a result of the execution by the execution causing unit to the managing computer and a unit, responsive to an instruction from the managing computer, for collecting management information including load information of the computer to be managed and returning the collected information to the managing computer. Further, according to the present invention, the managing computer includes a management information control portion including a unit which collects the managing information and the execution results transmitted from the managed computer, a unit coupled to the collecting unit of the managing computer, for managing operation of the managed computers using the operation defining information transmitted to the managing computers, the collected management information and the execution result and an integrated managing screen display unit which displays the state of management by the managing computer on a screen.

Each of claims 13-15 recites unique features of the present invention with respect to the integrated managing screen display unit.

For example, claim 13 recites structural features of changing over between a screen displaying a configuration of a plurality of computers and a screen displaying an execution state or a progress state of each of the computers executing jobs. Claim 14 recites structural features of changing a screen displaying a configuration of a plurality of computers and a screen displaying an execution state or a progress

state of computers executing jobs using specific representations such as symbols, colors, lengths with directions etc. Claim 15 recites structural features of switching between display screens and correlating a specific screen with each job.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record whether taken individually or in combination with each other.

Kisor discloses that a central computer instructs the execution of processes to a plurality of remote computers and receives results of the processes from the remote computer.

However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Kisor of the displaying of a configuration of the system including a plurality of computers in addition to displaying the states or conditions of processes performed by the plurality of managed computers as in the present invention.

Chou discloses a graphical user interface (GUI) which displays a log of execution results from each application performed by a single computer and a GUI which makes a schedule with respect to each application. The Examiner's attention is directed to Figs. 12-14 of Chou.

However, Chou similar to Kisor suffers from various deficiencies relative to the features of the present invention as recited in the claims. Particularly, Chou does not teach or suggest the displaying of a configuration of a system including a plurality of computers and the displaying of the states or conditions of processes performed by the computers as in the present invention. Further, Chou does not teach or suggest the displaying of execution conditions for the plurality of computers, the displaying of

a plurality of computers that are present on the network and the displaying of a plurality of applications that are performed by the computers as in the present invention.

Behm discloses a GUI which displays the state of each node in a system. The Examiner's attention is directed to col. 5, lines 30-52 and Fig. 2 of Behm.

However, the GUI as taught by Behm simply performs a screen drawing according to selections being made on the screen as input by the user. Behm specifically teaches in col. 5, lines 40-50 that:

"information related to the system is also displayed....
The operator can also display information about the jobs
queued and/or executing by clicking on a 'plural-down
menu'".

The above described teachings in Behm are merely the display of the status of a node, not a display which may have been generated due to changing over of the screen from one state to another state as in the present invention. In this regard, Behm specifically describes in col. 5, lines 38-39 that:

"the operator can see at a glance the current status of the screen"

Thus, in Behm the status is already displayed on screen. Accordingly, there is no teaching or suggestion in Behm that a GUI is provided for displaying a configuration of a plurality of computers and an execution state or a progress state of the computers executed a series of jobs as in the present invention. Therefore, Behm suffers from the same deficiencies relative to the features of the present invention as Kisor and Chou.

Since each of the references Kisor, Chou and Behm suffers from the same deficiencies relative to the features of the present invention as recited in the claims, combining these references in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Thus, Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Kisor, Chou or Behm whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the above described 35 USC §103(a) rejections of claims 13-15 as being unpatentable over Kisor taken individually or in combination with either one or more of Chou and Behm is respectfully requested.

As indicated above, the present Amendment adds new claims 16-24. New claims 16-24 recite many of the same features shown above not to be taught or suggested by any of the references of record whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Therefore, the same arguments presented above apply as well to new claims 16-24.


The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 9-15.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 13-24 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 13-24 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (500.36716CX1).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 312-6600